



Royalty Valuation and Management Federal Perspective

**Royalty Valuation and Management Conference
Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Foundation
Bonn J. Macy
February 4, 1998**

**is not new to MMS, the Federal Government
e World**

the most primitive form of royalty

concept goes back to the Ancient Greeks

royalties were originally paid “in-kind”

**ent Kings could not develop their resources
selves - so they contracted it out.**

“royalty” was part of the deal struck with miners

**A production share was delivered to the Crown in return for the
right to mine.**

Economic conditions changed...

Technological + productivity advances

New markets, monetary systems + changing labor

Did royalty collection...

**Relative costs of different activities associated with
royalty collection shifted**

Production outstripped needs

Needs changed as economic/political systems changed

Trade, mercantilism, growth of finance/moneylenders

Advantages of money over physical production

Became more attractive to take royalties in CASH

**Federal experience with royalties is
the recent**

**General royalties were paid in value
that RIK was explicitly recognized option**

**Secretary reserves the right to take
royalties in kind**

**Ready to do so when it makes sense for the Treasury
and rarely has made sense in our peacetime economies**

Now?

Over the last 25 years the economy has changed markedly - the "Information Age"
Telecommunications, financial markets, computers, regulation, competition, etc

What are the relative costs of royalty collection

Cheaper and easier for MMS to market the production
Information is cheap, transactions quick and easy
Costs of royalty verification, administration are relatively higher - more labor intensive

have the relative costs shifted enough?

**is behind the questions that MMS seeks to
over with its RIK pilots**

it economically efficient to take royalties in kind?

it accurate, simple and certain?- lowers admin cost

it revenue neutral?

**Can we effectively market our production and enhance
value?**

objective of Federal resource management

**maximize value to the taxpayer- can there be
other reason?**

**answer these questions, MMS is Prudently and
scientifically proceeding with RIK development
the last 4 years we've taken the time to look
earn before we leap**

there is a potential to lose money -

the 1995 Gas Pilot showed us that

there is the potential to earn money -

the 1997 Feasibility Study showed us that

**we've seen the pitfalls and the opportunities and
better understand the factors that dictate RIK
success**

**logical next step for MMS was to proceed
a larger, broader, more comprehensive test
Feasibility Study recommended three pilots
implemented.**

shore Oil pilot in Wyoming

small offshore gas pilot in 8(g) waters off Texas

offshore Gulf of Mexico gas pilot

**s chosen in areas when there was some
potential for success, State interest**

has put together a team of 15 people
representing a broad cross-section of MMS divisions,
skills and experience

participation from BLM, other agencies, and
Wyoming and Texas

working overtime to produce timely, efficient and
effective pilots

the Texas 8(g) gas pilot by Oct. 1, 1998
the Wyoming Oil pilot by Oct. 1, 1998
the offshore GOM gas pilot by Oct. 1, 1999

**Expanding the pilot to examine the many factors that
of RIK success**

**Test RIK in the two main producing basins of Wyoming:
the Powder River basin and Big Horn Basin**

Take Sweet crudes and sour asphaltic crudes

Take crude transported by Pipeline and truck

**Take crude from higher productivity wells and well as
lower wells**

**Market crude by competitive bidding/public auction
or by marketing direct to refiners and other marketers**

Royalty Production

45 bbls/day in Powder River Basin

20 bbls/day in Big Horn Basin

may take in-kind as much as half of that

of Wyoming pilot: up to 4000 bbls/day

necessary for adequate test

**marketing intelligence suggest minimum feasible contract
size of 500 bbls/day**

or half of Royalty Production will remain in-value

provides a benchmark to test program success

will run a minimum of two years

**nsive discussion with regional industry in
planning process**

et with producers, marketers, refiners

**discussing markets, transportation, constraints,
operational and management issues,**

**ly Interactive Process will continue
throughout the life of the pilot**

**ublic meeting scheduled for February 24th in Casper,
Wyoming -- an open forum to discuss tentative plans,
make comments, ask questions, learn more, and provide
accurate information to producers in the area.**